

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 1, 2005. Claims 23 to 44 are now pending in the application, with Claims 17, 18 and 22 having been cancelled. Claims 23, 24, 27, 36, and 41 to 44 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,438,385 (Heinonen) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0060246 (Gobburu) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,343,212 (Weber). Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Heinonen, Gobburu and Weber, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,703 (da Silva). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### Independent Claims 23 and 41

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 23 defines a system having an entrance/exit management apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person and a wireless communication terminal for communicating with the entrance/exit management apparatus. The entrance/exit management apparatus comprises a judgment device adapted to judge an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method. The entrance/exit management apparatus also comprises a transmission device adapted to transmit, by a first wireless communication method, an indication signal for indicating a

communication restriction of a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal in accordance with the judgment by said judgment device. The wireless communication terminal comprises a first communication device adapted to communicate with the entrance/exit management apparatus by the first wireless communication method, a second communication device adapted to communicate by the second wireless communication method, and a restriction device adapted to restrict communication of said second communication device in accordance with the indication signal received from the transmission device by said first wireless communication method.

Independent Claim 41 is a method claim that corresponds generally to the system of independent Claim 23.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 23 and 41, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of (1) judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, (2) transmitting, by the first wireless communication method, an indication signal for indicating a communication restriction of a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal in accordance with the judgment, and (3) restricting communication of a second communication device of the wireless communication terminal, which is adapted to communicate by the second wireless communication method, in accordance with the indication signal received from the transmission device by said first wireless communication method.

Heinonen relates to a cellular radio system in which a mobile station (MS)

sends and receives calls through a base station (BTS). In addition to calls, the BTS can also send a muting message to the MS, which causes the muting of the MS. Thus, Heinonen is merely seen to disclose that the muting message is sent and received using the same cellular radio system that is used for sending and receiving calls. However, Heinonen is not seen to disclose or to suggest transmitting, by a first wireless communication method, an indication signal for indicating a communication restriction of a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal in accordance with the judgment, and restricting communication of a second communication device, which is adapted to communicate by the second wireless communication method, in accordance with the indication signal received from the transmission device by said first wireless communication method. Heinonen also fails to disclose or to suggest judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with the wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method.

Gobburu is merely seen to disclose the use of a readable bar code displayed on a mobile phone (see page 10, paragraph 83). Gobburu's bar code is not seen to disclose or to suggest judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method.

The remaining art of record, namely Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen and Gobburu. Accordingly, independent Claims 23 and 41 are believed to be allowable.

#### Independent Claims 24 and 42

According to another aspect of the present invention, independent Claim 24 defines a system having an entrance/exit regulating apparatus for regulating an entrance/exit of a person and having a server apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person. The entrance/exit regulating apparatus comprises a judgment device adapted to judge an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal carried by the person whose entrance/exit is to be regulated. The communication with the wireless communication terminal is executed by a first wireless communication method. The entrance/exit regulating apparatus also comprises a restriction device adapted to restrict, in accordance with a judgment by said judgment device, communication by a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal, and a notification device adapted to notify the server apparatus of an indication that the wireless communication terminal whose communication was restricted by said restriction device exists in a predetermined area. The server apparatus comprises a management device adapted to manage an existence location of the wireless communication terminal in accordance with a notice supplied from said notification device.

Independent Claim 42 is a method claim that corresponds generally to the system of independent Claim 24.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 24 and 42, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of (1) judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal carried by the person whose entrance/exit is to be regulated, the communication with the wireless communication terminal being executed by

a first wireless communication method, (2) restricting, in accordance with a judgment by said judgment device, communication by a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal, and (3) a notification device adapted to notify the server apparatus of an indication that the wireless communication terminal whose communication was restricted by said restriction device exists in a predetermined area.

Heinonen's system of sending and receiving calls and muting messages over the same cellular radio system is not seen to disclose or to suggest judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal carried by the person, the communication with the wireless communication terminal being executed by a first wireless communication method, restricting, in accordance with the judgment, communication by a second wireless communication method of the wireless communication terminal, and a notification device adapted to notify the server apparatus of an indication that the wireless communication terminal whose communication was restricted by said restriction device exists in a predetermined area.

The remaining art of record, namely Gobburu, Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen. Accordingly, independent Claims 24 and 42 are believed to be allowable.

#### Independent Claims 27 and 43

According to another aspect of the present invention, independent Claim 27 defines an entrance/exit management apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person. The entrance/exit management apparatus comprises a judgment device adapted to judge an

entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, a transmission device adapted to transmit an indication signal to the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method, the indication signal for restricting communication, by a second wireless communication method, of the wireless communication terminal, in accordance with judgment by said judgment device.

Independent Claim 43 is a method claim that corresponds generally to the apparatus of independent Claim 27.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 27 and 43, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of (1) judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method, and (2) transmitting an indication signal to the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method, the indication signal for restricting communication, by a second wireless communication method, of the wireless communication terminal, in accordance with judgment by said judgment device.

Similar to the discussion above, Heinonen's system of sending and receiving calls and muting messages over the same cellular radio system is not seen to disclose or to suggest transmitting an indication signal to the wireless communication terminal by the first wireless communication method, the indication signal for restricting communication, by a second wireless communication method, of the wireless communication terminal, in accordance with judgment by said judgment device. In addition, Heinonen is not seen to

disclose or to suggest judging an entrance/exit of a person in accordance with communication with a wireless communication terminal by a first wireless communication method.

The remaining art of record, namely Gobburu, Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen. Accordingly, independent Claims 27 and 43 are believed to be allowable.

#### Independent Claims 36 and 44

According to another aspect of the present invention, independent Claim 36 defines a wireless communication terminal comprising a first communication device adapted to communicate with an entrance/exit management apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person by a first wireless communication method, a second communication device adapted to communicate by a second wireless communication method, and a restriction device adapted to restrict communication of said second communication device in accordance with an instruction received by said first communication device from the entrance/exit management apparatus which judged the entrance/exit of the person.

Independent Claim 44 is a method claims that corresponds generally to the apparatus of independent Claim 36.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 36 and 44.

Similar to the discussion above, Heinonen's system of sending and receiving

calls and muting messages over the same cellular radio system is not seen to disclose or to suggest a first communication device adapted to communicate with an entrance/exit management apparatus for managing an entrance/exit of a person by a first wireless communication method, a second communication device adapted to communicate by a second wireless communication method, and a restriction device adapted to restrict communication of said second communication device in accordance with an instruction received by said first communication device from the entrance/exit management apparatus which judged the entrance/exit of the person.

The remaining art of record, namely Gobburu, Kniffen, Ariga, da Silva, and Weber, is not seen to supply what is missing from Heinonen. Accordingly, independent Claims 36 and 44 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied reference for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 102858v3